

PART 4. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE—CDBG, HOME AND ESG

This part of the CAPER discusses DHCD's use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, as required by 24 CFR² 91.520(c) , and use of HOME and ESG funds in FY 2005.

CDBG PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Use of CDBG to meet the District's priority needs: The long-term priority areas for community planning and development initiatives in the Five-Year Consolidated Plan are:

- Homebuyer Assistance and Housing Recycling and Preservation
- Affordable Housing Production
- Community Organization Support, and
- Economic and Commercial Development

Affordable Housing Production:

DHCD spent \$42.3 million of CDBG funds in FY 2005 that, along with other federal and local funding sources, assisted in the acquisition, disposition, rehabilitation, conversion and production of 1,721 affordable housing units. (975 mf rehab, and 746 new). The increase in supply is a key step in reducing the barriers to affordable housing, along with efforts described above to promote fair housing. Details on the CDBG-funded rehabilitation portion of this investment are shown in the sidebar to the right.

Summary: CDBG (and Other)- Funding for Rehabilitation

103 single family units:	
CDBG funds:	\$ 347,623
Other funds:	1,341,704
490 multi-family units:	
CDBG funds:	\$14,820,676
Other funds:	23,750,058

Homeownership:

The Department also provided \$347,623 of CDBG funds for 103 loans and/or grants for single family residential rehabilitation in FY 2005 to help current owner/occupants remain in their homes. DHCD also provided \$5,627,776 of CDBG funds to assist 153 tenants toward ownership of their apartment units.

Support for Community Organizations

DHCD's provision of \$4.8 million to neighborhood community development organizations has enabled them to provide technical assistance to 1,856 small businesses and housing counseling to 17,662 households. All of these accomplishments promote the District's *anti-poverty strategy* by increasing economic opportunities in underserved neighborhoods.

Completion of planned actions: DHCD has pursued all of the resources in its Consolidated Plan, which primarily are leveraged dollars for the CDBG and HOME programs. DHCD also has provided local funds to augment its budget in pursuit of housing and community

² Code of Federal Regulations.

development goals. Its local and other (including loan repayments) public funds budget was \$97,279,762 including \$87,503,587 in local Housing Production Trust Fund dollars. For the first time ever, the locally-funded Housing Production Trust Fund was the largest single source of funds for affordable housing and community development.

DHCD uses its compliance checklist, which is jointly completed by the project manager and the Office of Program Monitoring, to ensure that proposals address national CDBG objectives and local Consolidated Plan goals, and that applicants meet CDBG eligibility requirements.

Income Beneficiaries: 90.40% of the District's CDBG funds have been used to provide benefits directly to low- and moderate-income persons.(PR26, line 22) Funded projects include either housing for income-eligible households or commercial and community facilities and infrastructure projects in census tracts that are CDBG-eligible.

CDBG-Funded Projects:

DHCD's proposed and actual awards for CDBG-funded projects are shown in Table 21: The full list of CDBG-funded development projects is also shown in the list of all Development Finance projects funded in FY 2005 from *all sources* in Appendix A.

Table 21: CDBG Proposed and Actual Project Awards, FY 2005

Proposed Project	Proposed Amount	Actual '04 Amt.
Walter Washington Community Center (Additional Funding)	\$2,500,000	\$1,575,000
526 Kenyon Street, NW	596,317	596,317
307 S Street, NW	945,000	945,000
Graceview Apartments	990,000	2,166,900
2nd Street Tenants Assn.	3,649,859	3,649,859
God is in Control at 1256 Cooperative	332,600	332,600
Patricia Sitar Center for the Arts	400,000	400,000
Carlos Rosario Career Center	250,000	250,000
Israel Manor Life Learning Center	955,000	955,000
Trenton Terrace Apartments	2,100,000	2,100,000
Hope Apartments	750,000	500,000
DC Housing Authority-ADA compliance improvements	2,100,000	2,100,000
Shipley Park Apartments	2,900,000	3,800,000
Capital Area Food Bank	1,000,000	7,708,000
Dance Institute of Washington	200,000	1,270,000
Easter Seals DC Child Development Center	233,228	325,839
Madeline Gardens	750,000	730,000

FY 2005 Development Projects Funded--- CDBG, and HPTF:

(See page 51 for HOME- funded projects.)

DHCD provided funding in FY 2005 for the following housing and community development projects, which were selected through its competitive funding process:

CDBG Projects	\$ Amount
Walter Washington Community Center	1,575,000
Graceview Apartments	2,166,900
Patricia Sitar Center for the Arts	400,000
Carlos Rosario Career Center	250,000
Israel Manor Life Learning Center	955,000
Trenton Terrace Apartments	2,100,000
Hope Apartments	500,000
Shipley Park Apartments	3,800,000
Dance Institute of Washington	1,270,000
Easter Seals DC Child Development Center	325,839
Capital Area Food Bank	7,708,000
Madeline Gardens	730,000
<u>TOTAL CDBG</u>	<u>\$21,780,739</u>

HPTF Projects (Housing Production Trust Fund)	\$ Amount
New Day Transitional Housing	1,626,547
Four Walls Development	773,808
Hope Apartments	1,300,000
Neighborhood Consejo	100,000
Phyllis Wheatley YWCA	679,294
Jubilee Housing Renovation Phase I	3,554,306
<u>TOTAL HPTF</u>	<u>\$8,033,955</u>

Relocation: In FY 2005, five projects had tenants and required the submission and approval of temporary relocation plans. The projects were: Shipley Park Apartments, Las Marias Co-Op, Finsbury Square Apartments, Jubilee Housing Renovation, and "A" Street Manor Co-Op. The developers of these projects are temporarily relocating tenants to other vacant units on their project sites to the extent possible in order to avoid relocation to off-project sites

It is DHCD's policy to minimize displacement in all its projects. Each program officer in the Development Finance Division keeps track of any relocation required for a project. Project Managers review developers' plans and revise those plans as necessary to minimize displacement. Where relocation is required, the project managers ensure, as part of the underwriting process, that the relocation plans are adequate and are funded as part of the project development costs. A number of DFD project managers have received training in the Uniform Relocation Act (URA). Development Finance also has convened a team to oversee project compliance, including URA compliance, and to update the Division's operating protocols to ensure that all specialized monitoring disciplines are being addressed.

Any required relocation generated by DHCD's single family rehabilitation projects is incorporated into each project work plan, and associated costs are factored into the budget.

Program changes:

While DHCD has used CDBG successfully to carry out its programs, DHCD nonetheless makes changes as needed. Changes related to CDBG-funded programs and activities include:

- DHCD continues to strengthen the monitoring protocols for its Development Finance Division programs and for the Neighborhood Investments Program,
- DHCD has increased the potential for HPAP recipients to purchase homes by obtaining from the Council of the District of Columbia in FY 2004 an increase in the subsidy provided to very low- and low-income households under its Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP). The program is seeking additional funding level increases and greater flexibility to meet the market challenges in FY 2006 (HPAP does receive CDBG funds in some years.)
- DHCD's consolidated façade improvement program is developing more effective policies and procedures. Improvements are currently taking about 18 months to complete, and will be reported on a bi-annual completion cycle.

DHCD's programs have been designed to meet the HUD national objectives of benefiting low- and moderate-income persons, and elimination of slums and blight (through, for example, acquisition, disposition and rehabilitation).

HOME PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

This part of the CAPER discusses DHCD's use of HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds, as required by 24 CFR 91.520(d).

Distribution of Funds: DHCD committed HOME funds (from various fiscal years) in FY 2005 as shown in Table 22.

Table 22: HOME Fund Investments, FY 2005

Investment	Project Type	Units	HOME Funds
4211 2nd Street, NW	Construction Assistance	23	\$950,000
Victory Heights	Construction Assistance	75	3,750,000
Various (HPAP)	Single Family Home Purchase	63	\$1,339,418
Various (DC HFA subsidy)	Single Family Home Purchase/Rehab		
Dubois Gardens Condominiums	Construction Assistance	17	484,666
Finsbury Square Apartments	Acquisition	134	6,000,000
Jubilee Housing Renovation- Phase I	Construction Assistance	118	4,586,787
Various	Single Family Rehab.	7	455,676
TOTAL		367	\$16,227,129

Discussion of HOME Investments:

DHCD executed contracts in FY 2005 for two projects that were issued Letters of Commitment in FY 2004. Those projects are Victory Heights, a 75-unit new senior affordable rental building, for which \$3,750,000 was obligated; and 4211 2nd Street, NE, a 23-unit affordable rental rehabilitation, for which \$950,000 was obligated

Further funding (\$484,666) for the Dubois Gardens Condominium (Dubois Gardens) was executed in FY 2005 for construction assistance. Dubois Gardens had been approved in FY 2004 for pre-development assistance.

Jubilee Housing Renovation—Phase I is a renovation of four multi-unit apartment buildings to which \$4,586,787 of HOME funds was obligated, in combination with local Housing Production Trust Fund dollars and Low Income Housing Tax Credits.

The projects cited above utilized HOME program funds for property acquisition and housing rehabilitation activities, to support both homeownership and rental housing development. All HOME-funded units (Table 22) **meet the Section 215** requirement for affordability.

CHDO Set Aside: DHCD committed the following funds for FY 2005 to meet the FY 2004 CHDO set-aside requirement by the November deadline

- Finsbury Square Apartments—134 units—acquisition for affordable rental units rehabilitation--\$6,000,000

Program Income: HOME program income of \$1,849,032 was recycled through the Construction Assistance Program of the Development Finance Division

Match Requirement: Under 24 CFR 92.218 *et. seq.*, the District must provide a matching contribution of local funds to HOME-funded or other affordable housing projects as a condition of using HOME monies. The District's FY 2005 contribution was 25 percent of its non-administrative HOME draws. The IDIS PR 33 report shows that the matching fund contribution required for FY 2005 is \$172,886.74, based on a "Disbursements Requiring Match" figure of \$1.38 million. DHCD provided this match through Housing Production Trust Fund-financed investments in housing that met the HOME definition of affordable housing. (See HOME Match Report, Appendix E.)

HOME Monitoring: In FY 2005, the Department continued to implement its long-term monitoring for HOME-funded units based on the HOME Monitoring Guide developed for DHCD with HUD's technical assistance. DHCD accomplished the following in implementing its HOME Monitoring Program:

1) Record Keeping: Database and Files

- a) Staff identified HOME rental and ownership projects and designed a database to capture pertinent HOME information for each type of project (homeownership or rental). The Development Finance Division's (DFD) HOME Projects database currently lists a total of approximately 1,557 HOME funded units.
- b) Staff established an order for monitoring files and created a file for each HOME project included in DFD's HOME Project database.

2) Process: Initiating Long-Term Monitoring of HOME Projects

Staff established a methodology for long-term monitoring processes and activities for all completed HOME projects. Attention continues to be focused on HOME projects throughout the "affordability period" currently underway in order to ensure that all developers are aware of and understand the HOME monitoring requirements and implement the appropriate processes in their leasing and project management activities

Staff has also created HOME Compliance Agreements which inform developers of how to prepare the unit files for compliance monitoring purposes and commits them to compile and

maintain the requisite documentation and information necessary for DHCD's short- and long-term monitoring activities.

Also, because of the differing short- and long-term monitoring requirements for rental and ownership projects, Staff is currently researching the question of whether or not HOME-assisted condominium projects should be monitored as HOME rental or HOME ownership units. Pursuant to 25 CFR 92.2, Staff is working with the Office of Program Monitoring (OPM) and the Office of the attorney General (OAG) to determine whether or not cooperative ownership in DC constitutes a homeownership interest. This research is necessary due to inconsistencies between the District's recordation of condominium buildings as single lots and the application of the DC landlord-tenant laws by the courts concerning legal issues that arise with regard to condominiums.

3) Field Work: Conducted Field and Unit Inspections of All Completed Rental Units

Staff has conducted field inspections of all completed HOME rental projects in its database and has completed unit inspections of a majority of those units. Staff has conducted physical inspections for 20% of HOME-funded units and reviewed the household tenant files for compliance with HOME rules and regulations.

4) Outreach, Education and Compliance: Informed Property Owners and Managers of HOME Responsibilities

Staff maintains contact with property owners and managers and HOME developers of ownership units to ensure their compliance with the HOME monitoring requirements and to provide technical assistance in the preparation of the HOME Occupancy and Rent Reporting Form and Certification document *or* the HOME Occupancy/Ownership Reporting Form and Certification and suggested financial reporting forms.

Staff developed payoff and subordination policies to regulate HOME-assisted homeowners' refinancing and selling activities.

Staff continues to conduct site visits with property managers of each completed HOME rental project.

5) Compliance and Monitoring:

Performing Review of Tenant Files - Staff has begun the review of tenant files for HOME rental projects currently in the database.

- a) Reviewing Rent Reporting and Certification Documents, Conducting Tenant File Reviews and Setting Annual Reporting Dates.

Staff is currently receiving clients' draft HOME rental projects' Rent Reporting and Certification documents, reviewing them and providing site/property managers with

comments which are to be incorporated into a final Rent Reporting and Certification document for final review and approval. Staff completed reviews of 2003 projects in 2004, and is now proceeding with monitoring projects completed in 2005.

b) Reviewing Occupancy/Ownership Reporting and Certification Documents and Assembling Copies of the Deeds of Trust Containing the HOME Covenants and Conditions for Each Ownership Unit.

Staff continues to receive lists of ownership units from developers, to obtain the relevant Deeds, Declaration of Covenants and/or Eligibility Covenant for each unit and to develop a record retention system for these documents

Affirmative Marketing Actions: The DHCD has ensured affirmative marketing actions of all HOME funded housing activities containing five units or more, in accordance with 24 CFR 92.351. Following is the city's method for ensuring regulatory compliance:

Application packages for HOME program funded activities contain information for owners, the general public and tenants that specifically explain fair housing requirements. Owners are informed that they must make good faith efforts to provide information and otherwise attract eligible persons from all racial, ethnic, and gender groups in the District to occupy the available housing units. The Equal Housing Opportunity slogan is used in press releases and on information soliciting owner participation.

DHCD requires property managers, owners and developers of HOME-assisted activities to adhere to the following practices in order to carry out the District's affirmative marketing procedures:

- Use the Equal Housing Opportunity logo/slogan or statement in any advertising or solicitation for tenants.
- Display fair housing posters wherever applicants are accepted.
- Inform and solicit applications for vacant units for persons in the housing market who are most likely to apply for rehabilitated housing without special outreach.
- Inform community agencies of the availability of units in order to reach the Hispanic community.
- Accept referrals from the D.C. Housing Authority.
- Use information supplied regarding apartment buildings occupied by community organizations and churches whose members are non-minority and are located in the various neighborhoods in which the program operates.

Through the HOME funding agreement, requirements and practices to which each owner must adhere in carrying out the HOME affirmative marketing procedures and requirements are delineated. DHCD provides internal support to the owners through its network of community organizations, churches, employment centers, fair housing groups and housing counseling agencies. In addition, commercial media, community contacts, equal opportunity logo and slogan and the display of the fair housing poster are used in requiring each owner to adhere to affirmative marketing procedures.

DHCD maintains a record of the frequency and type of information sent to community organizations with which it maintains contact. A record of the applicants responding and actual tenants accepted as a result of DHCD's outreach efforts is maintained for monitoring and assessment purposes. The District will meet the racial, ethnic and gender characteristic record keeping requirements as contained in Section 92.351 concerning tenancy before and after rehabilitation, and relocation data for displaced households.

DHCD will assess the affirmative marketing effort of owners by means of an agreement with the owner that shall be applicable for a period of 15 years (or other appropriate time period as determined by HUD requirements) beginning on the date on which all units in the project are completed. The assessment will be in the form of a determination of whether or not the owner has followed the criteria established for affirmative marketing efforts.

Compliance:

In implementation of the affirmative marketing requirements, the District complies with the laws and authorities referenced in 24 CFR 92.350 to assure nondiscrimination and equal opportunity in the use of its HOME funds.

Further, the District complies with the requirements of the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. 3601-20, and implementing regulations at 24 CFR 100, Executive Order 11063, as amended by Executive Order 12259 (Equal Opportunity in Housing) and implementing regulations at 24 CFR 107; Title VI of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 200d and implementing regulations at 24 CFR 1; the prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of age under the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; 42 U.S.C. 6101-07 and implementing regulations at 24 CFR 146; and the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of handicap under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and implementing regulations at 24 CFR Part 8; which provide that no person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, age or handicap be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant received Federal financial assistance and will take the measures necessary to effectuate this assurance. This assurance shall obligate the property owner, or in the case of any transfer of such property, and transferee,

for the period during which the real property or structure is used for the purpose for which the HOME grant funds were expended.

Non Discrimination: DHCD complies with Executive Order 11246 and the implementing regulations at 41 CFR Chapter 60, which provide that, *“no persons shall be discriminated against on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin in all phases of employment during the performance of Federal or federally-assisted construction contract”*; and with the requirements of Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; 12 U.S.C. 1701 u (Employment Opportunities for Businesses and Lower Income Persons in Connection with Assisted Projects).

Affirmative Action: The District ensures that property owners certify that contractors and subcontractors will take affirmative action to ensure fair treatment in employment, upgrading, demotion, transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and selection for training and apprenticeship; and to the greatest extent possible, will assure that opportunities for training, employment and contracts in connection with HOME assisted projects be given to lower-income residents and businesses in the project area.

The District affirmatively furthers fair housing in its HOME Program in accordance with the certification made with its Consolidated Plan pursuant to the actions described at 24 CFR 91.225.

Minority Participation in the HOME Program: The application materials for HOME Program funding (and all DFD funding) include Affirmative Action Plan requirements. The Affirmative Action Plan requirements establish goals for Local Small, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise participation in construction jobs provided and for the contractors and subcontractors hired for projects.

ESG PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program supports the District's homelessness Continuum of Care and the relevant objectives of the Consolidated Plan. The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth Families and Elders provides ESG funds via a sub-recipient agreement with the Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness.

1. Fiscal Year 2005 Accomplishments and Assessment

DHCD exceeded its FY 2005 Action Plan goal under the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) to provide shelter for 45 families. Shelter was provided for 83 families by supporting operations of a 45-family shelter at 1448 Park Road NE. The goal of assisting 270 individuals/families with emergency eviction prevention was not met, however. DHCD provided this assistance to 51 individuals and 64 families. Additionally, one shelter with 180 beds was renovated. (See also, Table 3 on page 8)

Tables 23 and 24 show the ESG expenditures and accomplishments for FY 2005.

Table 23: Homeless Support Expense, FY 2005

Program	Units	ESG Expense
Emergency Shelter Grant Program	N/A	\$505,990.00
Total	N/A	

Table 24: Accomplishments In Homeless Support, FY 2005

Activity/Service	Planned	Actual
Eviction Prevention grants	270*	115
Families provided shelter	45	83
Shelter Beds Renovated	280beds-	180beds

*families/adults

2. Distribution of Funds by Goals

Prevention: Prevention funds for the DC Emergency Assistance Fund are awarded through a Memorandum of Agreement that established a mutually beneficial partnership wherein ESG funds are supporting a citywide homeless prevention effort managed by the Foundation for the National Capital Region, which receives other prevention funds from the Fannie Mae Walkathon that occurs each November. The 2005 Action Plan goal for prevention grants was not met. Sixty four (64) prevention grants were made to families and fifty one (51) to individuals for a total of 115 rather than the projected 270 grants.

The original projection assumed that the ESG 2004 funding would begin to be used in FY 2005, but the contract was issued by DHCD to the Community Partnership in June 2005, and spending on eviction prevention did not begin before September 2005. This was due to a monitoring visit by HUD and changes in program requirements which needed to be resolved by DHCD, the Partnership and HUD before the eviction prevention could re-start.

Essential Services/Shelter Operations: The Community Partnership, in concurrence with the Department of Human Services (DHS), entered into a lease agreement with the owner of 1448 Park Road, NW when the former operator of this family shelter went out of business. Because of the importance of this site (the largest apartment-style shelter in the city's Continuum of Care), the difficulty of finding such units, and the relatively inexpensive lease cost of the units (averaging about \$530 a month), DHS and the Partnership concluded to lease the site and keep it in the inventory. The contract with the former operator had included funds for leasing the building. When the new shelter operator was chosen, the leasing of the building was separated from the services contract. Under the

ESG grant, the 2005 Action Plan projected assisting at least 45 families, but actually provided shelter to 83 families in a rotation through the family shelter.

Staff, Operating Costs and Administration: These costs are shared between the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth, Families and Elders and the Community Partnership. Since the Community Partnership assumed responsibilities in 1994 for building and managing the city's Continuum of Care, DHCD has sub-granted ESG funds to the Partnership and split the costs of administration.

In FY 2005, using ESG funds, the Community Partnership paid for the following activities as planned per its FY 2005 spending plan:

■ **Prevention/Emergency Assistance Grants for Families and Adults-**

- **Goal:** Grants were to be made to 270 recipients through the Emergency Assistance Fund and neighborhood-based Family Support Collaboratives.
- **Actual:** 64 families and 51 adults were assisted using \$186,551 in ESG 2003 funds.

■ **Essential Services/Shelter Operations**

- **GOAL:** Grants were to be made for the cost of rent at the Park Road Family Shelter (45 units), rent at the Spring Road Family Shelter, Supplies for the New York Avenue Shelter, Hypothermia Supplies and Security Wants.
- **Actual:** A total of \$257,018 was paid in expenses for Shelter Operations which funded the rent for the 45-family shelter, the Park Road Family Shelter.

■ **Renovation and Rehabilitation**

- **GOAL:** ESG 2003 recitals called for \$278,250 in ESG funds to be spent as needed on improving the District's Continuum of Care facilities. This action plan has a goal of improving 280 beds.
- **Actual:** ESG03 funds in the amount of \$48,739 were used to fund renovation improvements at Emery Shelter which started in August 2005 and were completed on October 3, 2005. The balance of the \$40,525.90 for this project was paid to the contractor by the Partnership on Oct. 6, 2005 for the completed job.

■ **Staff, Operating Costs and Administration**

- **GOAL:** Funds in the amount of \$39,350 were included in the ESG 2003 recitals to cover a portion of administrative costs for the Community Partnership's staff involved in the ESG program and for fiscal monitoring of ESG-funded activities.
- **Actual:** The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness spent \$13,692.00 of the budgeted amount for administration.

3. ESG Matching Funds

In addition to its federal ESG funds, the District provided local matched dollars to support outreach and prevention services; support shelter operations and fund renovation of shelter space. The District works to provide assistance for the homeless through community-based organizations, faith-based organizations and other non-profit service providers.

Table 25: Local ESG Match Expenditures for 2005

Prevention/Emergency Assistance Grants

Nonprofit Organization	Funding Source	Funding Level
Virginia Williams Family Resource Center (Family Central Intake) – operated by the Coalition for the Homeless	TANF block grant allocated by DHS, funding staff salaries	\$592,371.00
Total Prevention		\$592,371.00

Essential Services/Shelter Operations

Shelter Operations	Funding Source	Funding Level
Park Road Family Shelter, 1448 Park Rd NW	TANF and local funding, DHS Appropriation funding program costs	\$764,843.00
Total Shelter Operations		\$764,843.00

Renovations and Rehabilitation

Site	Capacity	Funding Source	Funding Level
Emery Shelter, 1725 Lincoln Rd. NE	180 men	DHS Appropriation for Staff salaries and facility operations	\$976,403.00
Total Renovations and Rehabilitation			\$976,403.00
Grand Total			\$2,333,617.00

4 .ESG MONITORING

During fiscal year 2005, DHCD reviewed the A-133 report for FY 2004 issued by Gelman, Rosenberg and Freedman which had no findings for the FY 2004 and closed the findings from the prior year.

DHCD conducted a site visit of the Community Partnership on April 13, 2005.

The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth, Family and Elders monitors the activities of the Community Partnership by requiring extensive documentation for any prevention and shelter operations activities it oversees. Renovation spending is monitored

with assistance of the DHS Facilities Management Oversight Division which conducts site visits on behalf of the ODMCYFE

CONTINUUM OF CARE AND SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

The Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program supports the District's homeless Continuum of Care and the related objectives of the Consolidated Plan that provide for homeless and special needs populations. An overview of the District of Columbia's current homeless problems and the policy objectives for ending homelessness is provided in the discussion that follows of *Homeless No More*. Within this overall context, ESG funds will continue to support prevention efforts and facilities operating at the entry point of the Continuum of Care, in order to maintain and improve those facilities even while the District works to build the permanent affordable and supportive housing that will end homelessness over time.

The following discussion provides the context for understanding the District's larger, multiyear effort to abate and end homelessness.

Discussion

(Excerpted from "Homeless No More: A Strategy for Ending Homelessness in Washington, D.C. by 2014", the District's 10-year plan):

In 2005 an estimated 17,500 people were homeless at some point during the year (annually). At a point-in-time about 1,775 are "chronically homeless" persons who lived either in shelters or on the streets throughout the year. At the point-in-time enumeration undertaken on January 25, 2005 by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG), there were 8,977 persons counted by public and private programs within the Washington, D.C. homeless Continuum of Care. About 6,026 of these persons were *literally homeless* – i.e., on the streets, in shelters or in transitional facilities. Another 2,951 persons were counted in 2005 as *permanently supported homeless* who are living within permanent supportive housing. Although included in the overall count of "the homeless," homelessness has effectively ended for these persons in supportive housing but could easily re-occur without ongoing support.

Over the last ten years the District and many private agencies have created one of the largest homeless Continuum of Care systems in the nation both to relieve the immediate suffering of people without shelter and help them with obtaining and keeping permanent housing. There are currently enough public and private beds to shelter or house about 9,520 persons, enough to serve 1-in-12 of all District residents living in poverty. A HUD report to Congress showed that the District has a rate of homelessness and shelter usage among single adults in poverty higher than New York City or Philadelphia. Another HUD report showed that the District's Continuum has more Continuum of Care beds per persons in poverty than other major cities such as Boston and San Francisco.

Table 26: Change in Publicly Supported Beds—1994-2004

	THE LAST TEN YEARS Publicly-supported beds			
	1994		2004	
	Beds	%	Beds	%
Emergency 12-24 Hr	3,331	75%	2,891	40%
Transitional	744	17%	1,808	25%
Permanent Supportive	381	9%	2,543	35%
TOTALS	4,457	100%	7,241*	100%
*increase of 62% in number of beds available				
Overnight 12-hr Shelter**				
"Low-barrier shelter"	1,144	26%	1,171	16%
** a subset of emergency shelter beds				

As displayed in the table above (Table 26), the District's *publicly supported homeless system* grew in size, adding about 2,800 new beds between 1994 and 2004, but also became more diverse in its composition and now offers more beds and services focused on ending homelessness one person, one family at a time. Improvements to the Continuum have been ongoing. The 10-year plan includes strenuous new efforts to continue making the Continuum and its facilities get better along the entire Continuum from emergency shelters to permanent supportive housing.

On an annual basis District agencies spend over \$30 million on programs targeted to the homeless, HUD contributes another \$16 million in McKinney-Vento Act funding, philanthropies contribute more than \$5 million, and private donations and faith-based programs contribute millions more.

Despite these investments of knowledge, energy, resources and dollars, homelessness persists in the District and has increased by about 10% since 2002 including the addition of more permanent supportive housing that has become a larger component of the District's Continuum of Care. The problem at the emergency end of the Continuum, especially for families, has been exacerbated lately by the rising cost of rental housing and could get worse without an increase in the federal government's commitment to affordable housing. The D.C. Housing Authority has on its waiting list for Housing Choice Vouchers about 16,000 households who have claimed a homeless preference, a figure which indicates that over an extended period of time many households have faced a homeless crisis and, although the vast majority of these households are not currently homeless, nevertheless their wait for a housing subsidy continues.³

³ The 16,000 figure is almost three times the number of "literally homeless" who were counted on the street, in shelters and transitional housing in January 2004. The DCHA list is including households that were assigned a homeless

To deal with such issues and to get beyond this recurring cycle of homelessness and seemingly endless allocation of substantial resources to ends far less than satisfactory, the Mayor of the District of Columbia is committing the DC government to build a neighborhood centered, mainstream funded, and housing focused system to end homelessness as we now know it within the next 10 years.

The District's 10-year plan to end homelessness rests on three centerpiece policies:

1. Increase homeless prevention efforts within local and federal government.
2. Develop and/or subsidize at least 6,000 units of affordable, supportive permanent housing to meet the needs of D.C.'s homeless and other very low-income persons at risk of homelessness.
3. Provide wraparound mainstream supportive services fully coordinated with Continuum of Care programs and special needs housing.

In short, the goals focus on 1) keeping as many people as possible from becoming homeless in the first place through direct prevention efforts and increasing the supply of affordable housing; and 2) enriching the homeless Continuum at all levels with supportive services that rapidly re-house persons with and without special needs. This refocuses the city's efforts over time from a "shelter first" to a "housing first" model that ends homelessness.

Within this general context ESG funds will continue to be used to support Policy Goal #1 to prevent homelessness and to maintain and improve the entry level of the Continuum of Care. Over the ten years of the Mayor's plan, the City plans to replace current emergency shelters with easy-access, rapid-exit "housing assistance centers" founded upon a new social contract. Those who can help themselves will take personal responsibility for their self-sufficiency and be helped to achieve this through on-site, mainstream case management, clinical, and employment services. ESG funds will be helpful in supporting both the operations and services of Housing Assistance Centers.

FY 2005 Continuum of Care

Utilization of McKinney-Vento Act "Continuum of Care" Funds

The FY 2005 Action Plan states that the District and Community Partnership will continue to seek McKinney-Vento Act "Continuum of Care" funds to maintain and build its system of care for homeless people. In FY 2005, the Community Partnership received notice of awards in the amount of \$16.24 million from its FY 2004 "Continuum of Care" application to HUD and in FY 2005 submitted an application for \$16.53 million in McKinney-Vento funds, most of that for renewals. The following project priorities chart is taken from the FY 2005 Continuum of Care application:

preference sometime in the last several years. An important data collection task that lies ahead for this plan will be to look at which households on the DCHA list are *currently* homeless.

Table 27: Continuum of Care Project Priorities

(1) Applicant	(2) Project Sponsor	(3) Project Name	(4) Numeric Priority	(5) **Requeste d Project Amount	(6) Term of Project	SHP	SHP	S+C
						new	renew	renew
The Community Partnership	Coates and Lane Foundation	Rapha House	1	\$964,432	2 yrs			
The Community Partnership	Community Council for the Homeless at Friendship Place	Friendship Permanent SH Project II	2	\$293,914	2 yrs			
The Community Partnership	Catholic Charities	Tenant Empowerment Network	3	\$257,404	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Latin American Youth Center	Latino Transitional Housing Partnership	4	\$580,428	1 year		TH	
Catholic Charities	Catholic Charities	St. Martin's House	5	\$168,641	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Catholic Charities	Mt. Carmel House	6	\$189,000	1 year		TH	
Community Family Life Services	Community Family Life Services	Trinity Arms	7	\$140,205	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Coalition for the Homeless	Employment	8	\$333,913	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	Catholic Charities	St. Matthias Mulumba House	9	\$245,422	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Neighbor's Consejo	Transitional 1	10	\$149,203	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Neighbor's Consejo	Transitional 2	11	\$300,000	2 yrs			
The Community Partnership	Community Family Life Services	Family Reunification	12	\$176,226	1 year		TH	
Families Forward	Families Forward	THP 1	13	\$229,046	1 year		TH	
Families Forward	Families Forward	THP 3	14	\$201,224	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Bright Beginnings	Day Care	15	\$175,219	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	Community Connections	Trauma/Suitland	16	\$109,725	1 year		PH	
The Community Partnership	New Hope Ministries	Safe Haven	17	\$232,880	1 year		SH-th	
So Others Might Eat	SOME	Mickey Leland Place	18	\$101,333	1 year		TH	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	Unity Inn #1	19	\$34,657	1 year		TH	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	Unity Inn #2	20	\$79,929	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Gospel Rescue Ministries	GRM TH Program	21	\$100,905	1 year		TH	
So Others Might Eat	SOME	Maya Angelou & Harvest House	22	\$513,940	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	House of Ruth	New Beginnings (WIR)	23	\$134,835	1 year		TH	
Coalition for the Homeless	Coalition for the Homeless	Spring Road	24	\$171,453	1 year		TH	
Community Family Life Services	Community Family Life Services	Family Support Collaborative	25	\$364,761	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	New Endeavors by Women	New Expectations	26	\$210,119	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Green Door	Green Door	27	\$144,758	1 year		PH	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	Kidspace #1	28	\$202,832	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	House of Ruth	Kidspace #2	29	\$83,511	1 year		SSO	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	Kidspace #2	30	\$204,916	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	Community Connections	HIV/G Street	31	\$132,300	1 year		PH	
The Community Partnership	Miriam's House	Miriam's House	32	\$141,214	1 year		PH	
The Community Partnership	Coates and Lane Foundation	Supported Housing Program	33	\$346,324	1 year		PH	

PART 4. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

(1) Applicant	(2) Project Sponsor	(3) Project Name	(4) Numeric Priority	(5) **Requeste d Project Amount	(6) Term of Project	SHP	SHP	S+C
						new	renew	renew
The Community Partnership	Rachael's Women's Center	Rachael's Permanent Housing	34	\$165,819	1 year		PH	
The Community Partnership	Christ House	Kairos House I	35	\$899,866	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Community Family Life Services	Brandywine	36	\$196,569	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Coalition for the Homeless	Blair TRP	37	\$204,748	1 year		TH	
So Others Might Eat	SOME	Exodus House	38	\$323,673	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Calvary Women's Services	Transitional Program	39	\$142,306	1 year		TH	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	HERSPACE	40	\$321,806	1 year		TH	
Community Connections	Community Connections	Training Apartments	41	\$98,175	1 year		TH	
Sasha Bruce Youthworks	Sasha Bruce	Independent Living Program #1	42	\$67,628	1 year		TH	
Sasha Bruce Youthworks	Sasha Bruce	Independent Living Program #2	43	\$129,593	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Unity Health Care	Health Care@ Federal City Shelter/CCNV	44	\$190,522	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	Community Connections	SMI/Girard Street	45	\$121,728	1 year		PH	
The Community Partnership	The Community Partnership	Chronic Homeless Initiative #1	46	\$266,084	1 year		PH	
Community Connections	Community Connections	TLC	47	\$106,864	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Transitional Housing Corporation	Partner Arms II	48	\$148,925	1 year		TH	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	Madison Transitional	49	\$144,083	1 year		TH	
Transitional Housing Corp.	Transitional Housing Corporation	Partner Arms I	50	\$127,385	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	JHP, Inc.	Employment @ CCNV	51	\$141,957	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	DC Central Kitchen	Employment Program @ CCNV	52	\$87,850	1 year		SSO	
The Community Partnership	Bethany, Inc.	Good Hope House	53	\$78,342	1 year		TH	
House of Ruth	House of Ruth	Reunified Families	54	\$84,383	1 year		TH	
Sasha Bruce Youthworks	Sasha Bruce Youthworks	Olaiya's Cradle	55	\$189,058	1 year		TH	
The Community Partnership	Woodley House	Holly House	56	\$86,003	1 year		PH	
Hannah House	Hannah House	THEIRS Reunification	57	\$148,115	1 year		TH	
Salvation Army	Salvation Army	Harbor Light Treatment Center	58	\$475,935	1 year		TH	
Office of Revenue Analysis	The Community Partnership	SRA #1	59	\$1,891,104	1 year			SRA
Office of Revenue Analysis	The Community Partnership	TRA #1	60	\$479,556	1 year			TRA
Office of Revenue Analysis	The Community Partnership	SRA #2	61	\$676,548	1 year			SRA
Office of Revenue Analysis	The Community Partnership	TRA #2	62	\$271,368	1 year			TRA
DC Department of Health Agency for HIV/AIDS	Community Connections	SRA	63	\$359,016	1 year			SRA
DC Department of Health Agency for HIV/AIDS	Community Connections	TRA	64	\$188,928	1 year			TRA
TOTAL REQUESTED AMOUNT			\$16,528,606					

- **Special Needs Housing:**

In addition, DHCD funds contributed to the following special needs housing programs for homeless families and disabled homeless adults (status of each noted in chart).

Table 28: Continuum of Care Special Needs Housing

Name	Sponsor	Address	Unit Count	Funding Sources	Status
Hope Apartments	Community of Hope	3715 2 nd Street, SE	13 units	HUD DHCD DCHFA Cornerstone	Completion expected in FY 2006
Independence Place	SOME	2800 "N" Street, SE	21 units	DHCD DCHFA AHP	Open for business
Good Hope House	Bethany, Inc.	1715 "V" Street, SE	7 units	DHCD/HOME HUD/SHP	Open for business.
Rachel's Women's Center	Rachel's Women's Center	Dupont Circle, Florida Ave NE	17 units	HUD	Open for business.
Scattered Sites	Green Door	6411 Piney Branch Road, NW 3471-14 th St, NW, 2721 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE	8 units 4 units 6 units	DHCD HUD/SHP	Open for business.
Diane's House	Diane's House of Ministry		8 units	DHCD	Awaiting completion of DHCD underwriting.
A New Day Transitional Housing	Johanning Temple of Praise/Way of the Word		12 units	DGCD	DHCD Executed contract for rehab in Dec. 2004
Graceview Apartments	House of Help, City of Hope		38 Units		DHCD executed contract for rehab in Jan 05..
Agape Apartments	RIGHT, Inc.		11 units	DHCD HUD/SHP	Expected completion in FY 2006
Totals			145 units		

PART 5. HOPWA PERFORMANCE REPORT

A. GRANTEE AND COMMUNITY PROFILE

The District of Columbia, Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration (HAA) is the Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS (HOPWA) Formula Grantee for the Washington, DC Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMA).

The purpose of HAA is to prevent the spread of HIV infection and to ensure the management, oversight, planning, and coordination of HIV/AIDS services and Programs in the District of Columbia, in collaboration with other government and Community organizations. HAA also administers the Ryan White Title I Program for the DC EMA, the District's Ryan White Title II, AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP), and Centers for Disease Control (CDC) funding for HIV/AIDS prevention and surveillance activities.

In addition to serving as the DC EMA regional grantee, HAA is also the local administrative agency for the HOPWA program in the District of Columbia. In Suburban Maryland, the Prince George's County Government, Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is the administrative agency with oversight of activities in Calvert, Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, and Prince George's counties. The Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) is the administrative agency for suburban Virginia with oversight of activities in the counties Of Arlington, Clarke, Culpeper, Fairfax, Fauquier, King George, Loudoun, Prince William, Spotsylvania, Stafford, and Warren. NVRC's responsibility also includes the cities of Alexandria, Culpeper, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas, and Manassas Park. In suburban West Virginia, the administrative agency is the AIDS Network of the Tri-State Area (ANTS) a non-profit community-based organization with responsibility for Jefferson County.

HAA continues to work in partnership with a number of community-based organizations in the effort to provide housing assistance and supportive services to persons living with HIV/AIDS in the District of Columbia. Some of the District's community partners include:

Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program

- Building Futures
- Community Family Life Services
- DC CARE Consortium
- Greater Washington Urban League
- Housing Counseling Services, Inc.
- La Clinica del Pueblo
- Our Children
- Perry School Community Service Center
- Terrific, Inc.

Facility Based Housing w/Supportive Services

- Coates and Lane
- Damien Ministries
- Healthy
- Hill's Community
- Joseph's House
- Miriam's House
- RIGHT, Inc.
- Northwest Church Family Network

Facility Based Emergency Housing w/Supportive Services

- Miracle Hands
- RAP, Inc.

Supportive Services Only

- Miracle Hands

In Suburban Maryland, the Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development (PGCHA) partners with Southern Maryland Tri-Copunty Community Action Committee, Inc., and the Charles County Government to provide services to citizens in their respective jurisdictions. The Whitman Walker Clinic no longer provides housing services for Prince George's County residents. In order to avoid a gap in services, the Housing Authority transitioned the delivery of housing services to its Rental Assistance Division for the residents of the County. Frederick and Montgomery Counties are part of the new EMSA for the City of Gaithersburg. Housing services are provided through a contract with the State of Maryland for residents of Frederick and Montgomery Counties.

Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) works in collaboration with:

Tenant- and Project-Based Rental Assistance

Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority
Arlington County DHS, Section 8
Fairfax County Dept. of Housing and Community Development
Loudon County Dept. of Social Services, Housing
Prince William Office of Housing and Community Development
Northern Virginia Family Service
Robert Pierre Johnson (RPJ) Housing Development Corporation,
Homestretch and
Whitman-Walker

Permanent AIDS Residence

Wesley Housing Development Corporation's Agape House

B. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENT

HOPWA funds were used to provide housing assistance to 1,162 individuals and families in the DC EMA. In the District of Columbia, HOPWA housing programs currently underway include two (2) Emergency housing, and seven (8)facility- based housing sites that provide short term housing and supportive services, Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) programs both in the District and all participating jurisdictions, Short Term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance (STRMU) programs, and Housing Information and Referral services. Short term and emergency assistance was provided for approximately 490 individuals and families during the fiscal year.

In the District, approximately 150 units of housing were available for individuals and families in supportive housing facilities from October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005. Clients were allowed to stay 30 days to 6 months, depending upon their level of need. With the assistance of the centralized housing intake/assessment program (Gate Keeper) and the strong network of housing providers, persons living with HIV/AIDS in need of housing assistance in the DCEMA were able to access HOPWA funded services.

A total of 1,185 individuals and families received HOPWA related services throughout the DC EMA for the period of October 2004 through September 30, 2005. Within FY'05 the DC EMA expended approximately \$11,802,000 (direct services only) using primarily HOPWA FY 20044, Yr 12 and Yr 13 funds.

KEY FACTS	CONTACT INFORMATION
Service Area: Washington, DC EMA Grant: Formula <u>Allocations:</u> FY 2001 \$ 8,721,000 (Yr. 10) FY 2002 \$10,451,000 (Yr. 11) FY 2003 \$ 9,862,000 (Yr. 12) FY 2004 \$11,802,000 (Yr. 13)	Debra G. Rowe, MHS Interim Director, HOPWA HIV/AIDS Administration DC Dept. of Health 64 New York Avenue, NE Washington, D.C. 20002 Phone: 202-671-4822 Fax: (202) 671-4860 Debra.rowe@dc.gov

C. ACCOMPLISHMENT NARRATIVE:

Overview of Activities Carried Out, Barriers Encountered, Actions Taken in Response to Barriers and Recommendations for Program Improvement

1. Overview of Activities Carried Out

In the District of Columbia, Housing Program staff was instrumental in reaching out to new HOPWA service providers. This effort resulted in the elimination of the waiting list of 124 PWAs as of June 2005. The existing 58 PWAs on the current waiting list are a result of new applications received by the Gatekeeper near the end of this reporting period. Two new agencies joined the network of housing providers offering Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) to persons living with HIV/AIDS. The Whitman Walker Clinic, which has been a provider of TBRA and other housing services throughout the EMA, has ceased their provision of these services. Also, with the assistance of the long-term centralized housing and information referral center (Gate Keeper) for persons living with HIV/AIDS (PWAs), HAA's HOPWA team was able to locate housing and landlords willing to accept tenant based rental assistance vouchers.

During the fiscal year, HOPWA funds continued to support emergency housing, short-term supportive housing, the demonstration project begun in a prior fiscal year—i.e. the Multi-Service Day Center for homeless persons living with HIV/AIDS in need of shelter during the day; — Tenant-Based Rental Assistance vouchers, a Housing Mediation program that assists with landlord/tenant concerns, and short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance.

Within the fiscal year a potential \$5.0 million Request For Applications (RFA) was issued in the District of Columbia for housing providers and supportive services. The program areas included Tenant Based Rental Assistance, Supportive Housing, Short Term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance, Transitional Housing, Capacity Building, Emergency Housing and Emergency Housing specifically for women. The HOPWA team, based on external and internal reviews, granted new awards that began on January 1, 2005 and provided cost extensions to existing providers based on performance.

During this period, Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) expended approximately \$1,301,499 using primarily HOPWA FY 2003-2004 or Yr. 12-13 funds. Ninety-two (92) HOPWA households maintained stable, independent housing through participation with one of the contracted tenant-based rental assistance providers. At the conclusion of the report period, one tenant-based rental assistance vendor is embarking on a regional rental assistance program. Heretofore, tenant-based rental assistance was provided by city/county housing offices whose programs were confined to the geographic boundaries of their jurisdictions. The new tenant-based rental assistance vendor, a well-respected, long-standing nonprofit organization, will be starting a regional program with about 5 slots available to be located anywhere the HOPWA-eligible household chooses housing within the Virginia portion of the EMA. It is anticipated that as the local, jurisdictionally-based programs lose participants through attrition, cost savings would be applied to new tenant-based rental assistance provider's regional program, thus fostering consumer choice. An additional 60 families received assistance establishing housing through provision of security deposits and first month's rent by three successive vendors. The first family occupying one of the two units of transitional housing purchased through acquisition funding during a previous year is preparing to graduate to independent housing. A replacement family, that is homeless or at risk of homelessness, will be recruited to fill

this slot in November 2005. The vendor offering this service has made one of its regular slots – not purchased with HOPWA funding – available to a HOPWA-eligible family. The project-based housing program undertaken with a local faith-based corporation is entering the third year of a 5 year term. The program has provided stable housing for eight households. One family has increased its income to the point that it no longer qualifies for HOPWA, so a new family will be recruited to fill the soon to be vacant slot. Rental units available through this vendor are often priced below prevailing rent standards, because this vendor accessed below-market rate financing on a number of its projects, making the investment of HOPWA dollars go further.

Two hundred thirty-three (233) HOPWA- eligible households received short-term assistance with rent, mortgage or utilities from three successive vendors. A more vigilant focus on HOPWA being the payor of last resort and HIV-relatedness of claims has reduced the number of payments made under this category over those paid last year.

A variety of support services complemented the Northern Virginia HOPWA housing offerings. Supportive services funds underwrote programming for the tenants of the region's only AIDS residence, including support for a highly-participatory tenants' council. Transportation to medical and key social service appointments, food vouchers, and entitlements counseling were also funded. The vendor that competed successfully to take over the Renter Services Project, housing information, budget counseling and housing search empowerment, after the previous vendor resigned, provided services for a period of months, but has since resigned. No replacement for this vendor has yet been identified. The HIV Resources Project, housed at NVRC, continues to provide web-based information resources on housing and other services important to HOPWA-eligible persons. The HIV Resources Project receives about 900 inquiries per month.

Rental costs and vacancy rates have moderated somewhat in Northern Virginia over the previous report period, making it a little easier for HOPWA-eligible people to identify appropriate housing.

West Virginia:

In West Virginia, the AIDS Network has continued a cooperative relationship with local and state HOPWA organizations. The HOPWA case manager is a member of the Homeless Coalition of the Eastern Panhandle. However, homeless services offered in Jefferson County are very limited. Transportation in Jefferson County remains a barrier to access services.

2. Barriers Encountered, Actions Taken in Response to Barriers, and Recommendations for Program Improvement

District of Columbia:

The District has encountered a number of barriers in FY 2005. The most significant obstacles are:

- The shortage of affordable housing due to the steady increase in housing costs,
- Difficulty accessing permanent housing opportunities upon transition out of the HOPWA housing continuum, and
- The need for a more cohesive reporting of Tenant-Based Rental Assistance amount the jurisdictions.

Recommendations:

1. Continue to utilize the Gatekeeper to outreach to and identify potential housing units and unit holders,
2. Continue monthly networking meeting with HAA-funded providers to implement identified methodologies for the transition of PWAs out of the TBRA continuum. These methods include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - Identify the available housing options for transition of PWAs to more permanent housing such as Section 8, Elderly 202, public housing for long term or 811 within three years,
 - The FY 06 initiative of housing specific case managers who will be assigned to each District of Columbia TBRA provider to assist clients with effective implementation and follow-up of housing plans; Explore and implement referral and follow-up to educational and job-training programs;
 - Work with housing provider network sub-committee to develop a triage protocol for housing, and
 - Implementation in FY 06 of the PWA Homeownership Initiative which will provide:
 - ◆ 12 two-hour workshops on budget and credit issues
 - ◆ Provision of these workshops to 60 HOPWA-eligible PWAs
 - ◆ 20 HPAP- ready clients
3. Develop and implement a plan to broaden the District's centralized housing intake/assessment program (Gatekeeper) to service the entire EMA. This program has been very instrumental in the intake and tracking of each and every TBRA, Supportive and STRU recipient of housing services in the District. The result will be centralized registration of each client in the EMA, which will assist HAA with fiscal accountability, reporting and tracking.

West Virginia

Barriers Encountered:

There continues to be a lack of appropriate and affordable housing, especially in Jefferson County. There is also a lack of public and affordable private transportation for clients residing in Jefferson County who need to make scheduled appointments or travel for employment. All HIV-related services are located in Berkeley County. The Martinsburg Housing Authority has it's a waiting list of over two years. Clients who do qualify for Section 8 have been unable to receive assistance through the program. Additionally, the subsidized housing units in Jefferson County have waiting lists from three months to one year. It is even longer for families with children. There are no homeless shelters available in Jefferson County. Because of the competition from Northern Virginia residents relocating to Jefferson County, there is a lack of safe, affordable and appropriate housing in that county for clients living on a low income.

Recommendations:

West Virginia has expanded the transportation assistance to assist clients in accessing HIV-related services located in Berkeley County. The availability of transportation has assisted in the ability to provide housing assistance to clients in the Jefferson County area.

Northern Virginia:

Barriers Encountered:

Although conditions have eased somewhat, Northern Virginia is still an expensive place to live. The demand for HOPWA assisted housing still exceeds supply, and the region has a waiting list of about 150 persons with HIV/AIDS.

This year, the region experienced significant vendor turnover due to "burnout" with the HOPWA program. NVRC lost one long-time local housing office administering Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA). The replacement non-profit vendor that operated the Renters' Services program and also provided housing information, counseling, search assistance and empowerment has also discontinued operations.

Recommendations:

Recommendations for overcoming some of these barriers are:

- Get the Housing Counseling/Renter's service initiative underway to aid those who, even though they may obtain HOPWA and/or Section 8 vouchers, are

unable to procure housing because of credit ratings, police records, and/or an inability to search for housing that is of a safe, decent, and sanitary nature. Improve timeliness of contract negotiation and payments from the Grantee to reduce vendor burnout.

- Opting to search for housing that is in the higher spectrum of the voucher limits that may have much higher values of qualifications. We are also continuing to offer information on other housing assistance programs to PWAs, via the HIV Resources Project and other venues to help those on the waiting list find other housing options;
- Supporting state and local initiatives to increase the supply of affordable housing in the region. For example: this past year, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisory approved the designation of a portion of the real estate tax collected in the County—approximately \$16 million annually—for development of affordable housing;
- Using workshops and other information channels to seek out new avenues of funding with existing agencies and relaying that information on to providers and vendors.
- Actively requesting that housing vendors consider the assignment of current HOPWA clientele into other areas of subsidy, (that they currently oversee) thus opening up new slots within the HOPWA environment.

Suburban Maryland:

Barriers Encountered:

In Suburban Maryland, the increase of the FMR still does not help people get into housing. There is a higher demand for Tenant Based Rental Assistance, however, poor credit and higher rental prices` continue to be a barrier for HOPWA clients seeking housing.

3. Program Monitoring

All housing providers submit monthly programmatic reports that detail the number of clients served/housed, support services provided, demographics information, and type of unit leased up. They also include a narrative report that indicates the accomplishments and barriers identified for that month.

Accomplishment information is reported in the following section, Section D.

ACCOMPLISHMENT DATA

In the District of Columbia in FY 2005, HOPWA funds were used to provide:

- Housing assistance for 45151 individuals and families in the form of emergency shelter, short term supportive housing, and Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA); and
- Supportive Services to 1,344 units of housing for individuals and families; which included mental health care, substance abuse treatment, need assessments, transportation, case management services, and housing information and referral services to over 1,806 individuals.

A total of 1,185 individuals and families received HOPWA related services throughout the EMA for the period of October 2004 through September 30, 2005. During this period the DC EMA expended approximately \$11,802,000 (direct & supportive services only) using primarily HOPWA Yr. 13 funds. (DC FY 2005)

Section E, below, contains HOPWA 2005 Performance Summaries for the EMA and each jurisdiction.

E. HOPWA 2005 PERFORMANCE SUMMARIES

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units Dedicated to Persons with HIV/AIDS which were Supported during the Operating Year WASHINGTON, D.C. EMA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	650	\$6,176,458.	0	0	0	650
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	490	\$600,446	0	0	0	490
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	45	\$2,610,061	0	0	0	45
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	1,185	\$9,392,965	0	0	0	1,185
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	-2	0	0	0	0	-2
TOTAL	1,185	\$9,392,965	0	0	0	1,185

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions, as approved in the Action Plan/Consolidated Plan for this Operating Year (Estimated Numbers of Units) WASHINGTON D.C. EMA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	558	650
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	894	490
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	22	45
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	1,474	1,185
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	1,474	1,185

All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units Dedicated to Persons with HIV/AIDS which were Supported during the Operating Year. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	279	\$3,409,467	0	0	0	279
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	162	\$261,105	0	0	0	162
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	72	\$2,590,413	0	0	0	72
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	513	\$6,260,985	0	0	0	513
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	513	\$6,260,985	0	0	0	513

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions, as approved in the Action Plan/Consolidated Plan for this Operating Year (Estimated Numbers of Units) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	272	279
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	300	162
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	10	72
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	582	513
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	582	513

All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units Dedicated to Persons with HIV/AIDS which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN MARYLAND						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	202	\$1,636,051	0	0	0	202
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	83	\$148,973	0	0	0	83
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	285	\$1,785,024	0	0	0	285
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	285	\$1,785,024	0	0	0	285

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions, as approved in the Action Plan/Consolidated Plan for this Operating Year (Estimated Numbers of Units) SUBURBAN MARYLAND		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	235	202
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	8	83
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	243	285
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	243	285

Suburban Maryland includes Calvert, Charles, Frederick, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.
 All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration.

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units Dedicated to Persons with HIV/AIDS which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN VIRGINIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	163	\$1,108,130.	0	0	0	163
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	233	\$173,721	0	0	0	233
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	12	\$19,648	0	0	0	12
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	408	\$1,301,499	0	0	0	408
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	408	\$1,301,499	0	0	0	408

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions, as approved in the Action Plan/Consolidated Plan for this Operating Year (Estimated Numbers of Units) SUBURBAN VIRGINIA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	158	163
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	294	233
3-a. Units with operating costs	12	12
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	464	408
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	464	408

Note: Suburban Virginia includes the counties of Arlington, Clarke, Fairfax, Fauquier, King George, Loudoun, Prince William, Spotsylvania, Stafford and Warren; as well as the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas and Manassas Park. All data provided by the DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units Dedicated to Persons with HIV/AIDS which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN WEST VIRGINIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	6	\$22,810	0	0	0	6
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	23	\$22,647	0	0	0	23
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	29	\$45,457	0	0	0	29
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	-3	0	0	0	0	-3
TOTAL	26	\$45,457	0	0	0	26
Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions, as approved in the Action Plan/Consolidated Plan for this Operating Year (Estimated Numbers of Units) SUBURBAN WEST VIRGINIA						
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year		Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)			
1. Rental Assistance	10		6			
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	25		23			
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	0		0			
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0		0			
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0		0			
Subtotal	35		29			
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0		0			
TOTAL	35		29			

Suburban West Virginia includes Jefferson County.

All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration.